

values of this country are such that torture is not a part of our soul and our being." I agree.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to ensure that we not only outlaw torture conducted directly by U.S. government personnel, but that we also stop any practice which involves outsourcing or contracting out torture to other nations.

I urge Members to join in cosponsoring this legislation.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FORMER LEBANESE PRIME
MINISTER RAFIK HARIRI

SPEECH OF

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2005

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution, offered by Representative RAHALL of West Virginia, condemning the terrorist attack of February 14, 2005, that killed former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri and to honor the life and legacy of the former Prime Minister.

Born in Sidon, Lebanon, in 1944, Rafik Hariri, a Sunni Muslim, was not born into wealth, but into a farming family. In 1965, seeking a better life, he moved to Saudi Arabia where he worked as a schoolteacher and accountant before starting his own business. Through hard work and particular skill in the construction industry, former Prime Minister Hariri acquired what many have estimated to be a fortune in excess of \$2 billion.

Mr. Hariri began his involvement in the political and economic life of Lebanon long before he became prime minister. As a Lebanese businessman living in Saudi Arabia, he played a behind-the-scenes role as a mediator, advisor and promoter of cease-fires and agreements to end the civil war that ravaged Lebanon from 1975 to 1990. He invested his time and extensive contacts throughout the world to bring peace to his war-torn country.

In 1984, Mr. Hariri participated in the Geneva and Lausanne conferences to bring about political reconciliation in Lebanon and helped broker initiatives to put an end to the civil war.

In 1989, Mr. Hariri was the power behind the Taif Agreement, which succeeded in ending the war and the drafting of a new constitution for Lebanon. This agreement was the political contract that laid down the principles of national reconciliation that ended a dark chapter in Lebanon's history.

In 1992, he returned to his home country to assume office as prime minister after 28 years of living and working in Saudi Arabia. He formed his first government on October 22, 1992.

He immediately began an ambitious rebuilding program whose crown jewel was the rebuilding of Beirut's war torn central district. Today, this district is a vibrant and beautiful center of commerce and culture that rivals that of the world's other great cities.

Rafik Hariri was a man of peace and a man of diplomacy. He was the kind of man the United States and our allies need as we seek to spread freedom and democracy throughout the Middle East.

I had the opportunity to meet Mr. Hariri on a number of occasions. He was a kind and

humble man and the extent of his generosity towards the people of Lebanon, and those throughout the world, may never be fully known. He used his own personal wealth to give thousands of students the opportunity to gain a college education that they would have otherwise been unable to afford.

Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that a thorough and internationally validated investigation will uncover many facts about the assassination of Lebanon's former Prime Minister who remained a sitting member of parliament. Rafik Hariri was the leader of a political faction that many thought would take back control of Lebanon's government in parliamentary elections scheduled to take place in May. I know, from my personal meetings with Prime Minister Hariri, that he held deep reservations and misgivings about the continued presence of Syrian troops and Syrian secret police in Lebanon. Most often, it was not what he said, but what he indicated he could not talk about that most starkly expressed the reservations he had about Syria's role in Lebanon.

Following this national tragedy, Lebanon must now try to hold free and fair parliamentary elections in May. It is my fear that the assassination of Mr. Hariri, and the many other past assassinations that have too often gone without significant investigation in Lebanon, will have a chilling effect on freedom of speech and those who would vocally criticize the continued Syrian presence.

To say it plainly, it is time for Syrian troops and all the Syrian secret police to leave Lebanon. The security that Syria once provided is no longer needed and having security only for those who ally themselves with the continued Syrian presence is incompatible with democracy in Lebanon.

Mr. Speaker, I support UN Resolution 1559 that demands a, "strict respect of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, unity, and political independence of Lebanon under the sole and exclusive authority of the Government of Lebanon throughout Lebanon," and for all, "foreign forces to withdraw from Lebanon."

Rafik Hariri fought for a democratic and prosperous Lebanon. The United States, even after his death, should continue to press for Prime Minister Hariri's vision for Lebanon and a better Middle East.

BROADCAST DECENCY
ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 2005

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in cautious support of the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005. While I believe the public should be able to trust that the content of programming during peak viewing times is age-appropriate for children, I am concerned that strict regulations, if improperly applied, can result in infringements on our right to free speech.

Parents ought to be able to watch or listen to public broadcasting without fear that obscene material is foisted on their children. The Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) role in encouraging and enforcing decency regulations provides parents with a level of se-

curity that their family can watch television together or listen to the radio on the way to school without concern about the appropriateness of the information for their children.

As our society's values have changed with different trends, the FCC has provided a standard to guide broadcasters and encourage them to take into account the diversity of their audience when making programming decisions. This bill will retain these standards and dramatically increase the amount a broadcaster can be fined for each violation. While I support keeping broadcasters accountable to the public, I believe excessive fines could be a slippery slope toward violations of first amendment rights and public access to a diverse discussion of ideas. I am, therefore, supporting this legislation but with a deep concern that Congress may well have to re-examine the nature of these fines in future legislation, particularly if they have the effect of prior restraint on first amendment freedoms.

In light of recent scrutiny of indecent material, many broadcasters, artists, and performers are looking toward unregulated airwaves, such as cable and satellite radio. If these programs and performers move to these arenas, the quality of public airwaves leaves with them. The free flow of ideas is the cornerstone of our society, and opens the minds of Americans to different ideas, cultures and lifestyles. Public television and radio provides a medium for these ideas to reach all Americans, not just those who can afford it.

So it is with some deep hesitation that I vote for this bill, as I hope it will not set a dangerous precedent of excessive fines and regulation on television and radio content and possibly infringe on our first amendment rights, but instead ensure that broadcasters are aware and accountable for the content which they air.

I am including an editorial printed in the Rocky Mountain News in March 2004, which I think raises important concerns to consider regarding the increase in fines that this bill will administer.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, March 15, 2004]

CONGRESS SHOULD RETREAT IN 'INDECENCY'
WAR

Members of the U.S. House of Representatives stampeded Thursday to pass a bill to appease voters offended by the Superbowl display of Janet Jackson's breast. Unfortunately, all of Colorado's House delegation (with the exception of Mark Udall, who did not vote) displayed a herd mentality.

The Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act, H.R. 3717, raises the maximum fine for a decency violation to \$500,000, an amount that applies both to on-air personalities and to broadcast outlets. But because broadcasters often own many outlets, and programs often air in multiple markets, the total fine for even a single slip of the tongue (or the wardrobe) can be astronomical. The legislation was introduced in January, before the Super Bowl, so it is probably just coincidence that the new fine amounts to just about one dollar for each of the more than 500,000 complaints about the halftime show that flooded into the offices of the Federal Communications Commission. But the rapid passage is certainly no coincidence. Public outrage spooked Congress into acting.

The vote was 391-22, with Ron Paul, R-Texas, the lone Republican to stand up against congressional censorship.

A Senate measure, S. 2056, has similar provisions for raising fines, but also suspends